UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CASEY BLOTZER: JOSH FRIEDMAN; and JİLLIAN GREEN, Individually and On Behalf of All Others Similarly

V.

MARKETING a/k/a INSTANT **INSURANCE TRANSFERS; and** STATE FARM MUTUAL **AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE**

Defendants.

Case No.: '13CV1797 JAH NLS

CLASS ACTION

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES AND JUNCTIVE RELIEF PURSUANT TO THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT, 47 U.S.C. § 227, ET SEO.

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Introduction

- 1. CASEY BLOTZER ("Ms. Blotzer," collectively the "Plaintiffs"), JOSH FRIEDMAN ("Mr. Friedman," collectively the "Plaintiffs") and JILLIAN GREEN ("Ms. Green," collectively the "Plaintiffs") bring this Class Action Complaint for damages, injunctive relief, and any other available legal or equitable remedies, resulting from the illegal actions of INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING a/k/a INSTANT INSURANCE TRANSFERS ("INSTANT INSURACE MARKETING," collectively the "Defendants") and STATE FARM MUTUAL AUTOMOBILE INSURANCE COMPANY ("STATE FARM," collectively the "Defendants") in negligently and/or intentionally contacting Plaintiffs on Plaintiffs' cellular telephones, in violation of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., ("TCPA"), thereby invading Plaintiffs' privacy. Plaintiffs allege as follows upon personal knowledge as to themselves and their own acts and experiences, and, as to all other matters, upon information and belief, including investigation conducted by their attorneys.
- 2. The actions alleged herein to have been undertaken by the Defendants were undertaken by each defendant individually, were actions that each defendant caused to occur, were actions that each defendant authorized, controlled, directed, or had the ability to authorize, control or direct, and/or were actions each defendant assisted, participated in, or otherwise encouraged, and are actions for which each defendant is liable. Each defendant aided and abetted the actions of the defendants set forth below, in that each defendant had knowledge of those actions, provided assistance and benefited from those actions, in whole or in part. Each of the defendants was the agent of each of the remaining defendants, and in doing the things hereinafter alleged, was acting within the course and scope of such agency and with the permission and consent of other defendants.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

3.	The TCPA was designed to prevent calls like the ones described within this
	complaint, and to protect the privacy of citizens like Plaintiffs. "Voluminous
	consumer complaints about abuses of telephone technology - for example
	computerized calls dispatched to private homes – prompted Congress to pass
	the TCPA." Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC, 132 S. Ct. 740, 744 (2012).

4. In enacting the TCPA, Congress intended to give consumers a choice as to how creditors and telemarketers may call them, and made specific findings that "[t]echnologies that might allow consumers to avoid receiving such calls are not universally available, are costly, are unlikely to be enforced, or place an inordinate burden on the consumer. TCPA, Pub.L. No. 102-243, § 11. Toward this end, Congress found that:

> [b]anning such *automated* or prerecorded telephone calls to the home, except when the receiving party consents to receiving the call or when such calls are necessary in an emergency situation affecting the health and safety of the consumer, is the only effective means of protecting telephone consumers from this nuisance and privacy invasion.

Id. at § 12 (emphasis added); see also Martin v. Leading Edge Recovery Solutions, LLC, 2012 WL 3292838, at *4 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 10, 2012) (citing Congressional findings on TCPA's purpose).

- 5. Congress also specifically found that "the evidence presented to the Congress indicates that automated or prerecorded calls are a nuisance and an invasion of privacy, regardless of the type of call..." Id. at §§ 12-13. See also, Mims, 132 S. Ct. at 744.
- 6. As Judge Easterbrook of the Seventh Circuit recently explained in a TCPA case regarding calls similar to this one:

The Telephone Consumer Protection Act ... is well known for its provisions limiting junk-fax transmissions.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

A less-litigated part of the Act curtails the use of automated dialers and prerecorded messages to cell phones, whose subscribers often are billed by the minute as soon as the call is answered—and routing a call to voicemail counts as answering the call. An automated call to a landline phone can be an annoyance; an automated call to a cell phone adds expense to annoyance.

Soppet v. Enhanced Recovery Co., LLC, 679 F.3d 637, 638 (7th Cir. 2012).

7. The Ninth Circuit recently affirmed certification of a TCPA class case similar to this one in Meyer v. Portfolio Recovery Associates, LLC, F.3d , 2012 WL 4840814 (9th Cir. Oct. 12, 2012).

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 8. This Court has federal question jurisdiction because this case arises out of violation of federal law. 47 U.S.C. §227(b); Mims v. Arrow Fin. Servs., LLC, 132 S. Ct. 740 (2012).
- 9. Venue is proper in the United States District Court for the Southern District of California pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because Plaintiffs are residents of the State of California and Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in the County of San Diego, State of California as it conducts business there.

PARTIES

- 10. Plaintiffs are, and at all times mentioned herein were, citizens and residents of the State of California. Plaintiffs are, and at all times mentioned herein were, "person(s)" as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 11. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that STATE FARM is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation whose primary corporate address is in Bloomington, Illinois.
- 12.STATE FARM is and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation and is a "person," as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 13.STATE FARM is a nationwide provider of automobile insurance.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

- 14.Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING is, and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation whose primary corporate address is in Los Angeles, California.
- 15.INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING is and at all times mentioned herein was, a corporation and is a "person," as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153 (39).
- 16.INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING is a privately held marketing firm that provides sales and marketing services to insurance agents.
- 17. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING was acting as the agent for STATE FARM, the principal, at all times relevant. In this capacity, Plaintiffs are informed believe, and thereon allege, that INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING was authorized to act on behalf of STATE FARM to solicit business from and/or create legal relationships with third parties, such as Plaintiffs.
- 18.At a minimum, INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING maintained apparent authority to act on behalf of STATE FARM, since Plaintiffs reasonably believed that an agency relationship existed with STATE FARM and this reasonable belief was traceable to a manifestation of STATE FARM.
- 19.STATE FARM knowingly accepted the benefits of the TCPA violations alleged herein by receiving compensation from consumers solicited on behalf of STATE FARM by the agents of STATE FARM.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

20.On or about July 16, 2013, STATE FARM or its agent INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING contacted Ms. Blotzer on Ms. Blotzer's cellular telephone number ending in 3426 via an automatic telephone dialing

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- system ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), using an "artificial or prerecorded voice" as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 21.On or about June 19, 2013, at approximately 4:07 p.m., INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING, as an agent for STATE FARM, contacted Mr. Friedman on Mr. Friedman's cellular telephone number ending in 5289 via an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), using an "artificial or prerecorded voice" as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 22. Beginning on or about May 31, 2013, INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING, as an agent for STATE FARM, contacted Ms. Green on Ms. Green's cellular telephone number ending in 6190 via an automatic telephone dialing system ("ATDS") as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(a)(1), using an "artificial or prerecorded voice" as prohibited by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A).
- 23. This ATDS has the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator.
- 24. At no time did Plaintiffs enter into a business relationship with Defendants.
- 25. At no time did Plaintiffs provide their cellular phone numbers to Defendants through any medium.
- 26. Upon information and belief, the purpose of these calls from STATE FARM or its agent INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING was to solicit business from Plaintiffs regarding automobile insurance.
- 27. After Ms. Blotzer received a prerecorded call from telephone number (714) 676-2045, Ms. Blotzer called the number back and was connected to a representative of INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING. This representative attempted to solicit business from Ms. Blotzer regarding automobile insurance. After Ms. Blotzer provided information about the year, make and model of her car, she was transferred to a representative of

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

STATE FARM.

On a separate occasion, Mr. Blotzer called back the same number and provided information regarding a different make and model of a vehicle and was again transferred to a representative of STATE FARM.

- 28. The prerecorded call received by Mr. Friedman from telephone number (323) 679-2214 concerned the lowering of insurance rates and was an attempt to solicit Mr. Friedman's business. When a person calls back the number (323) 679-2214, the person hears a prerecorded message stating, among other things, that automobile insurance companies such as State Farm are competing for the consumer's business. Upon information and belief, when a consumer calls back telephone number (323) 679-2214, presses "1" to speak with a live representative, and expresses interest in receiving an automobile insurance quote, that individual is transferred to a representative of STATE FARM.
- 29. When Ms. Green received one of the prerecorded calls from telephone number (714) 676-2045, she pressed "1" to be connected to a live agent who informed Ms. Green that the call was from INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING. This of **INSTANT** INSURANCE representative MARKETING transferred Ms. Green to a representative of STATE FARM. Prior to transferring the call, the representative of INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING informed Ms. Green that INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING regularly sends clients to STATE FARM.
- 30. Upon information and belief, STATE FARM solicits and/or accepts insurance leads provided by INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING to STATE FARM on behalf of STATE FARM.
- 31.STATE FARM or its agent INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING contacted Ms. Blotzer from telephone number (714) 676-2045 belonging to STATE FARM or INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

///

///

///

///

- 32. To date, Ms. Green has received two calls from INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING acting as an agent for STATE FARM, including on or about May 31, 2013 from telephone number (949) 954-3115 at approximately 1:09 p.m. PST, and on or about July 22, 2013 at approximately 4:20 p.m. PST from telephone number (714) 676-2045.
- 33.STATE FARM contacted Ms. Green by live representative from telephone number (949) 646-4848 at approximately 4:31 p.m. PST on July 22, 2013.
- 34.STATE FARM or its agent INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING contacted Mr. Friedman from telephone number (323) 679-2214 belonging to STATE FARM or INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING.
- 35. The telephone numbers STATE FARM or INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING called were assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiffs incur a charge for incoming calls pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1).
- 36. These telephone calls constituted calls that were not for emergency purposes as defined by 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(A)(i).
- 37. Plaintiffs did not provide Defendants prior express consent to receive calls to their cellular telephone utilizing an ATDS or artificial or prerecorded voice, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227 (b)(1)(A).
- 38. These telephone calls by Defendants or their agent(s), violated 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), except for the telephone call described in Paragraph 33.

27

28 ///

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 39. Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all others similarly situated (the "Class").
- 40. Plaintiffs represent, and are members of the Class, consisting of:

All persons within the United States who received any telephone call from Defendants or their agent to said person's cellular telephone made through the use of any automatic telephone dialing system or with an artificial or prerecorded voice within the four years prior to the filing of the Complaint.

- 41. Defendants and their employees or agents are excluded from the Class. Plaintiffs do not know the number of members in the Class, but believes the Class members number in the tens of thousands, if not more. This matter should therefore be certified as a Class action to assist in the expeditious litigation of this matter.
- 42. Plaintiffs and members of the Class were harmed by the acts of Defendants in at least the following ways: Defendants, either directly or through its agents, illegally contacted Plaintiffs and the Class members via their cellular telephones by using an ATDS and/or artificial or prerecorded voice, thereby causing Plaintiffs and the Class members to incur certain cellular telephone charges or reduce cellular telephone time for which Plaintiffs and the Class members previously paid, and invading the privacy of said Plaintiffs and the Class members. Plaintiffs and the Class members were damaged thereby.
- 43. This suit seeks only damages and injunctive relief for recovery of economic injury on behalf of the Class, and it expressly is not intended to request any recovery for personal injury and claims related thereto. Plaintiffs reserve the right to expand the Class definition to seek recovery on behalf of additional persons as warranted as facts are learned in further investigation and discovery.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 44. The joinder of the Class members is impractical and the disposition of their claims in the Class action will provide substantial benefits both to the parties and to the court. The Class can be identified through Defendants' records or Defendants' agents' records.
- 45. There is a well-defined community of interest in the questions of law and fact involved affecting the parties to be represented. The questions of law and fact to the Class predominate over questions which may affect individual Class members, including the following:
 - Whether, within the four years prior to the filing of the Complaint, a) Defendants or their agents sent any artificial or prerecorded voice message to the Class (other than a message made for emergency purposes or made with the prior express consent of the called party) using any automatic dialing system to any telephone number assigned to a cellular phone service;
 - b) Whether Plaintiffs and the Class members were damaged thereby, and the extent of damages for such violation; and
 - Whether Defendants and their agents should be enjoined from c) engaging in such conduct in the future.
- 46. As persons that received at least one prerecorded call utilizing an ATDS without Plaintiffs' prior express consent, Plaintiffs are asserting claims that are typical of the Class. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the Class in that Plaintiffs have no interests antagonistic to any member of the Class.
- 47. Plaintiffs and the members of the Class have all suffered irreparable harm as a result of the Defendants' unlawful and wrongful conduct. Absent a class action, the Class will continue to face the potential for irreparable harm. In addition, these violations of law will be allowed to proceed without remedy and Defendants will likely continue such illegal conduct. Because of the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- size of the individual Class member's claims, few, if any, Class members could afford to seek legal redress for the wrongs complained of herein.
- 48. Plaintiffs have retained counsel experienced in handling class action claims and claims involving violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act.
- 49. A class action is a superior method for the fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy. Class-wide damages are essential to induce Defendants to comply with federal and California law. The interest of Class members in individually controlling the prosecution of separate claims against Defendants is small because the maximum statutory damages in an individual action for violation of privacy are minimal. Management of these claims is likely to present significantly fewer difficulties than those presented in many class claims.
- 50. Defendants have acted on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief and corresponding declaratory relief with respect to the Class as a whole.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

NEGLIGENT VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- 51. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 52. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous and multiple negligent violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.
- 53. As a result of Defendants' negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 54. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATIONS OF THE

TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- 55. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.
- 56. The foregoing acts and omissions of Defendants constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violations of the TCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above-cited provisions of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.
- 57. As a result of Defendant' knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq., Plaintiffs and the Class are entitled to an award of \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
- 58. Plaintiffs and the Class are also entitled to and seek injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court grant Plaintiffs and the Class members the following relief against Defendants, and each of them:

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR NEGLIGENT VIOLATION OF THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.

- As a result of Defendants' negligent violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiffs seek for themselves and each Class member \$500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

Kazerouni Law Group, APC Santa Ana, California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR KNOWING AND/OR WILLFUL VIOLATION	ONS OF
THE TCPA, 47 U.S.C. § 227 ET SEQ.	

- As a result of Defendants' knowing and/or willful violations of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1), Plaintiffs seek for themselves and each Class member \$1,500.00 in statutory damages, for each and every violation, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(A), injunctive relief prohibiting such conduct in the future.
- Any other relief the Court may deem just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY

59. Pursuant to the seventh amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, Plaintiffs are entitled to, and demand, a trial by jury.

Dated: August 1, 2013 Respectfully submitted,

KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP, APC

By: /s/ Abbas Kazerounian Abbas Kazerounian ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07) Case: 1:13-cv-07389 Document #: 15 Filed: 08/01/13 Page 14 of 15 PageID #:14

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE PEVENSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)		DEFENDANTS		
` '	SH FRIEDMAN; and JILLIAN GREEN	l,	INSTANT INSURANCE MARKETING a/k/a INSTANT INSURANCE TRANSFERS; and STATE FARM MUTUAL		
Individually and On Beh	nalf of All Others Similarly Situated,	Đ			
(b) County of Residence			County of Residence of	f First Listed Defendant	
(E	XCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)			(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
				O CONDEMNATION CASES, US NVOLVED.	SE THE LOCATION OF THE
(c) Attorney's (Firm Name	e, Address, and Telephone Number)		Attorneys (If Known)	'13CV1797 JAH NLS	
Kazerouni Law Group, A Santa Ana, CA 92705 (8	APC; 2700 N. Main Street, Suite 1000			100111	07 07(11 1120
II. BASIS OF JURISI	•			RINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff
☐ 1 U.S. Government	■ 3 Federal Question	(For Diversity Cases Only) PT	TF DEF	and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF
Plaintiff	(U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citize	n of This State		rincipal Place
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity	Citize	n of Another State	2	
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Ciri	n an Sahirata da		
			n or Subject of a eign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FO	RFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJUR		0 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State Reapportionment
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury		0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure	☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	410 Antitrust
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury		of Property 21 USC 881	28 USC 157	☐ 430 Banks and Banking☐ 450 Commerce
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	•		0 Liquor Laws	PROPERTY RIGHTS	☐ 460 Deportation
& Enforcement of Judgment			0 R.R. & Truck	☐ 820 Copyrights	□ 470 Racketeer Influenced and
☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Injury Product Liability Liability		0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational	☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPER		Safety/Health	_ oro mudeman	☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV
(Excl. Veterans)	☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud		0 Other	O CO LA CE CAMPANA	□ 810 Selective Service
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	Liability ☐ 371 Truth in Lending ☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal		LABOR 0 Fair Labor Standards	SOCIAL SECURITY 861 HIA (1395ff)	■ 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damage		Act	☐ 862 Black Lung (923)	☐ 875 Customer Challenge
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability		0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	12 USC 3410
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability Injury	y 1 /30	0 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act	☐ 864 SSID Title XVI ☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	■ 890 Other Statutory Actions ■ 891 Agricultural Acts
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS PRISONER PETITIO	ONS □ 740	0 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act
☐ 210 Land Condemnation	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vaca		Other Labor Litigation	☐ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff	□ 893 Environmental Matters
□ 220 Foreclosure□ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment Sentence ☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	□ 79	l Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant) ☐ 871 IRS—Third Party	□ 894 Energy Allocation Act□ 895 Freedom of Information
☐ 240 Torts to Land	Accommodations		Security Act	26 USC 7609	Act
☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty		IMMIGRATION		☐ 900Appeal of Fee Determination
☐ 290 All Other Real Property	☐ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 540 Mandamus & Ot Employment ☐ 550 Civil Rights		2 Naturalization Application 3 Habeas Corpus -		Under Equal Access to Justice
	☐ 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - ☐ 555 Prison Condition		Alien Detainee		☐ 950 Constitutionality of
	Other	□ 463	5 Other Immigration		State Statutes
	☐ 440 Other Civil Rights		Actions		
V. ORIGIN (Place	an "X" in One Box Only)				Appeal to District
	tate Court Appellate Court	Reop	ened anothe		
VI CAUSE OF ACTI	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 47 U.S.C. § 227 et seq.; 5:5	are filing (1 552	Do not cite jurisdictiona	nl statutes unless diversity):	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Brief description of cause: Violations to the Telephone Con	nsumer I	Protection Act		
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DI 5,000,0	EMAND \$ 01.00+	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	if demanded in complaint: Yes □ No
VIII. RELATED CAS		2,200,0	-	JUNI DEMIAND	, - 100 = 110
IF ANY	(See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER	
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TTORNEY (OF RECORD		
08/01/2013	s/Abbas Kazer	rounian			
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY					
RECEIPT# A	AMOUNT APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JU	DGE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44

Authority For Civil Cover Sheet

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

- I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.
- (b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)
- (c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".
- **II. Jurisdiction**. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

- III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.
- IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.
- V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

- VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. **Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity**. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553
 Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service
- VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.